THE NEW REPUBLIC

Spy Flights and US Bases

Thomas R. Phillips

AUG

The Original Elmer Gantrys

James B. Moore

What the Platforms Say

A Comparison

Playing Castro's Game

Dispatches from Havana and Mexico City

August 8, 1960, 25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T.R.B. *from Washington*

Change of Plans

★ Who will win in November? At this stage we won't guess. It will be hard for Nixon to attract all the independents and Democrats he needs to get a majority. But other factors are involved also. Two of them, we suspect, won't be discussed widely and could be decisive. One is Kennedy's Catholicism. The other is the deep-seated and (we are persuaded) widespread distrust of Nixon. How can you compute and balance off such emotions that defy logic and analysis?

Whatever you think of Kennedy's choice of Lyndon Johnson, you have to admit its galvanic effect on Nixon. He had expected to take the South; when Kennedy picked Johnson, Nixon wrote that off. He acted with boldness and decisiveness. He changed all his plans. He made his surprise pilgrimage to Rockefeller, pressed a strong civil rights plank, sought in every way to pin a liberal label on the GOP, and fatalistically accepted that he must somehow win the big industrial states and the restive farm belt. Ezra Taft Benson was doomed anyway, but Nixon chucked him earlier than expected. Then he picked handsome, light-weight Lodge as running mate to build up what he considers his trump suit – toughness to Moscow.

We watched the political old pros at Chicago nod their heads approvingly. For the moment at any rate the big thing there seemed to us to be to get rid of Eisenhower. Whoever wins in November, we shall do that; we shall have change – moderate change with Nixon, a great deal of change with Kennedy. Maybe the real issue in this campaign is how much change you want.

Eisenhower's big farewell day at Chicago was a recapitulation of his dreary eight year themes – tranquility, serenity, complacency. He implied that it is unpatriotic to criticize or point out that the West's over-all position in the cold war has declined during his incumbency. Yet every student knows it. Next day Eisenhower made his silly attack on the Swedes ("A fairly friendly European country," he extemporized). They have "a tremendous record for socialistic operation," he said, and hence their drunkenness and suicide rates have gone up! It was unbelievable, unless you saw his earnest, eager face, that a man with notions like that should be guiding our country in time of peril. Few recalled he made just another such attack on the French in 1952 – as a doubtful ally because of their loose home life.

Perfect of Its Kind

★ We always invite trouble when we praise Nixon. Yet we can think of no GOP nominee in our time who compares with him in political skills. At Chicago, after his nomination, he put on an unrehearsed midnight TV tableau with mother, wife, and girls that was far more sophisticated than his Checkers broadcast. It was a perfect thing of its kind, we thought, as he registered humility and responsibility. Then his acceptance speech was one of the most impressively effective political 50 minutes we ever witnessed. He rang every bell. We think Nixon is better equipped to do this sort of thing than any man the GOP has nominated in half a century, and young Mr. Kennedy had better realize it.

On the evening of the day last month when Kennedy made his Khrushchev "apology-regret" statement to an Oregon street rally, this reporter – in an hour's relaxed end-of-campaign discussion with 20 other newsmen – rather paternally suggested to the candidate that he had, perhaps, made a slip of the tongue. It was in the U-2 crisis and all the State Department chickens were coming home to roost. Kennedy dismissed our comment lightly, but with a little undercurrent of uneasiness.

His meaning had been plain enough, as the transcript shows. Khrushchev demanded not merely an apology but that the US should "try those responsible," an impossible demand. Unfortunately in explaining this to a curbside questioner, Kennedy repeated the word "apologize," coupling it with his own word "regret" and half-assented to it in order to repudiate more strongly Khrushchev's demand for a public trial. "If he (Khrushchev) had merely asked that the US should express regret, then that would have been a reasonable term," Kennedy said.

Kennedy's Candor

★ Many writers assert Nixon and Kennedy are alike as two peas – cool, calculating automatons. We disagree. Nixon would never have made this slip. We doubt if he makes any slip in the campaign. By contrast it was Kennedy's candid responsiveness that produced this incident. He is an attractive figure as he answers questions; he is unemotional and hates histrionics, but he does give the audience the impression of saying what he thinks, of speaking his mind.

There is one clear-cut, astonishing party difference this year: Democrats have come out unequivocally for Federal responsibility for speeding up national growth and base their whole expansion program upon it. Anyway you look at it, this is radical – though based on a coherent modern economic philosophy. The Eisenhower economy has been repressive; his advisors in their hearts oppose full employment as inflationary. But have they carried this too far; is a new recession coming? Note that the day Nixon was nominated the Reserve Board threw a lifeline to the laboring stock market by reducing margin requirements. (We smiled to discover Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, had tickers at the GOP amphitheater!)

They'll Never Learn

★ The one economic sin is to keep a democracy's industry idling; that is the situation in the US today with 5 percent unemployed (4.5 million), and steel production only 55 percent. Idle men, idle plants! The Administration can't learn. Fearing a deficit the Treasury drastically cut defense orders in July, 1957, triggering the 1957-58 recession with its incredible $12.5 billion deficit. Fortuitous government spending, answering the Soviet Sputnik, cured the recession, though the Administration has never seemed to realize it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW REPUBLIC *A Journal of Opinion Volume 143 Number 6 Issue 2386 August 8, 1960*
Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed by The New Republic, *1244 19th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Phone: FEderal 8-2494. Single copy 25c. Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00, Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Advertising rates upon request. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Include old and new address Copyright© 1960, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc. Item g. Second class Imprint, reading Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C.*

Teams and Drivers

THE WEEK

3. Teams and Drivers; Nixon On-stage; The Defense Issue; What the Platforms Say; Brotherly Help for the Congo

ARTICLES

8. Keeping Cool About Cuba by Samuel Shapiro
8. Playing Castro's Game by Ralph Winnett
10. Excerpts from the Platforms of the Two Parties
12. The Superficial Aspect by Gerald W. Johnson
13. The Generation That Waited by David Evanier
15. Overseas Bases by Thomas R. Phillips

DEPARTMENTS

17. Books *21. Art*
22. Correspondence

THE STAFF

Gilbert A. Harrison, Editor & Publisher
Helen Fuller, Managing Editor
Selig S. Harrison, Associate Editor
Robert Evett, Books & the Arts Editor
F. R. Ruskin, Assistant to the Publisher

Contributing Editors:
Alexander M. Bickel, Robert Brustein, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Christopher Jencks, Gerald W. Johnson, Stanley Kauffmann Helen Hill Miller, Howard Simons, Michael Straight

That's quite a team of elephants the Republican Presidential nominee is going to be driving. Some pull to the right, others to the left, and the rest want to lie down in the middle of the road. But Mr. Nixon has shown that he is far more able and willing to crack the whip than Ike and crack it he did in Chicago. The descriptive adjective for the Vice President is neither liberal nor conservative, but opportunistic. He is not a prisoner of principle. He understands that no Republican can be elected President on a platform that evades, denies or ignores the demands at home for more public services, the demands abroad of new nations for more aid and respect, and the seriousness of Communist military, economic and political competition. In that sense, he too is one of the "new men" – but a new man whose success depends upon appeasing the old men in his party. And most of them, as was seen in Chicago, believe that what was good enough for the 19th Century is good enough for the 20th. They are made uncomfortable, even indignant, by self-criticism; they view government as a necessary evil, not as a useful instrument by which elected representatives can wisely manage the public's business; they are parochial at heart, as unsophisticated in their appreciation of the character of Communism as they are naïve about the aspirations and problems of restless peoples inhabiting other continents.

Mr. Nixon knows better, for he is a realist. But before much more is said by Senator Goldwater and some of the columnists about how little difference there is between Mr. Nixon's attitudes and those of the "new men" in the Democratic Party, one thing should be made plain. The Vice President has no taste for, indeed he has an aversion to, fully using the powers of the Presidency or of the federal government to accelerate our rate of economic progress or to allocate more sensibly what we produce so as to serve better the long-range national interest. He is *for* better education, more adequate health care for the aged, urban renewal and slum clearance – but in every case he is for letting the problems be dealt with largely by private business, by states or by local government. And what this means in practice is that the problems are dealt with timidly and inadequately. To say all that distinguishes Mr. Nixon from Mr. Kennedy is the means each would use, rather than the ends each has in view, is to miss the significance of this election. For means are almost the whole meaning of politics in 1960.

Still, it must be acknowledged that Mr. Nixon, as a realist, would like to do many things which powerful members of his party in and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of Congress oppose. And it will not be easy for him to be true either to himself or to his shrewd instinct for what victory requires, and to be true at the same time to those who have nominated him.

It has also become apparent in the last several weeks, however, that Mr. Kennedy's stable also has its balky animals, and donkeys are notoriously stubborn and hard to manage.

On that final day in Los Angeles, when one saw on the same platform all those beaming Democratic leaders, who hours earlier had been scowling and scratching at each other – when one heard Stevenson praising Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson saying how grateful he was for "the happy privilege of campaigning on your platform" and that "wherever he [Kennedy] wants me to go, I will go" – one almost believed that every good Democrat from that moment on would trot happily in harness at the bidding of the driver. That conclusion was premature.

Now of course Mr. Kennedy's Democratic detractors have not so completely lost their wits as to suggest as the Republicans will that their candidate is "too young," or that he won't "stand up to Khrushchev"; or that he *will* (and thus endanger the peace). Their resentments are of a different sort. Some grumble about the over-prominence of the Kennedy clan and especially the manipulations, not always tactful or modest, of brother Bobbie. Yet Bobbie has been highly effective, and why he should not continue to serve his brother is not apparent. Papa Kennedy worries others, for, they ask, might he not be contributing ideas and influence as well as money to the cause? Now if a father did not want to advise his son or did not want his son to be President, that would be news. It would likewise be news should any evidence be uncovered that Jack believes Father knows best when it comes to public policy.

One hears complaints about Senator Kennedy's aloofness, his crisp and businesslike manner; and, oddly, the complaints come from the very same people who have been crying for Presidential decisiveness instead of White House homilies and handshakes. Then, of course, there are the resentments of those who have been accustomed to having a hand, or a voice, in running the Democratic Party and who foresee that the Kennedy campaign will be directed largely by a few close trusted friends of the candidate. When power shifts, it always shifts to someone's disadvantage, but it is worth recalling that at least a few of these critics were bitter in 1952 and 1956 over what they considered to be Stevenson's lack of professionalism – his reliance on "amateurs." In 1960, having seen what professionalism can accomplish, they aren't sure they like it – largely because theirs are not the hands on the wheel.

Others, and they include letter-writers to *The New Republic*, are sure that Kennedy's selection of Lyndon Johnson previews a backwatering on the basic Kennedy progressive appeal to urban and minority voters in the North, East and West. That remains to be seen, but nothing that has happened so far gives substance to the suspicion. Moreover, if one assumes, though the record gives one no right to assume, that Lyndon Johnson's influence is inimical to a government responsive to public needs or responsive to the requirements for bold action abroad, then surely a Johnson bound to a Kennedy Administration as Vice President is preferable to a free wheeling and perhaps hostile Johnson remaining in the Senate as Majority Leader. And to this one must add that those who think progress will be made in the South without the help of Southerners have yet to explain how it is going to happen.

With the exception of the McCarthy censure (for which Mr. Kennedy was not present), it is rarely said by liberals that Kennedy hasn't voted their way; but was he *sincere*, did he do it for the right reasons? Yes, he has made his position admirably clear on separation of Church and State; but does he *mean* it? Admittedly, he delivers literate and informed speeches; but isn't that because he uses those bright people at Harvard and MIT?

Let Senator Kennedy take heart. There were Democrats who tried to dump President Truman in 1948; there were Democrats who wished they'd never heard of Adlai Stevenson; and a party that can unite Senator Eastland and Senator Humphrey, Senator Dodd and Senator Douglas, Harry F. Byrd and Wayne Morse – without blowing up – is capable of almost anything. There are not many wounds in the Democratic Party that Republican campaign oratory won't heal.

Nixon Onstage

In *David Copperfield*, Uriah Heap is the young man who heeds the fatherly advice to "Be umble, and you'll get on." Confided Uriah to David: "And really it ain't done bad." Mr. Nixon might yet add a glowing testimonial for the Heap formula. From the moment he stepped out of his helicopter in Chicago and held his first umble press conference, had his first umble shoe shine, paid his first umble tribute to Mr. Eisenhower – from that moment until the final umble acceptance speech, Mr. Nixon added something new to the tired pottage of American politics. John Kennedy may want to walk to Washington, but Mr. Nixon evidently intends to umble along on his knees – his face shining with reverence for Honest Abe, Mom and Dwight Eisenhower.

David Copperfield scorned "the detestable cant of false humility." How will the country react to Nixon in the new Umble Image? Our own snap judgment would be that while the short-term reaction might be favorable, the Umble Nixon will grow increasingly tire-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some as the weeks of the campaign go by and the candor which is Kennedy's most attractive characteristic gets greater exposure. Still, we are slightly shaken by the fact that the acceptance speech, which struck us as the most transparent and banal kind of ham acting, has been widely rated as a brilliant political performance. James Reston notes that it had "all the right notes of modesty, love of country, compassion for the inexperienced Democratic enemy, defiance of the wicked Communists, and religious conviction." TRB in this issue adjudges it "one of the most impressively effective political 50 minutes we ever witnessed. He rang every bell." Not to mention the predictable Scripps-Howard report (headed "There Were Tears in Pat Nixon's Eyes") that when Dick said he had seen the American dream come true, that moment "gave the world a glimpse of the kind of people America is made of." One is reminded that a good portion of the electorate develops goose-pimples over Norman Rockwell's art, weeps at the travails of Our Gal Sunday, and feels a tremble of the heart at Edgar Guest. "An honest arrogance," said Frank Lloyd Wright, "is preferable to a false humility." But Mr. Wright could not have been elected recorder of deeds in Spring Green, Wisconsin.

The Defense Issue

"One of the reasons I have been able to get additional duties from the President," said Vice President Nixon in his July 25 press conference on arrival in Chicago, "is that I have shared his views. He was able to trust me in giving me those duties." Mr. Nixon made this as no more than a parenthetical comment in the course of explaining why he wanted a Vice President who shared *his* views. But it was remarkable that he could make the statement at all with a straight face when one considers the fury of the backstage struggle going on with Dwight Eisenhower at that very moment.

According to accounts given to this journal in Chicago by several of the second-line individuals directly involved in this struggle, Mr. Eisenhower flew into a rage, the intensity of which has not been generally reported, on learning at Newport of the "Fourteen Point" manifesto issued following the Convention-eve Nixon visit to Rockefeller's Fifth Avenue apartment. He was especially outraged, it is said, over the clear criticism of his defense budget implicit in the statement that "the United States can afford and must provide the increased expenditures to implement fully this necessary program for strengthening our defense posture. There must be no price ceiling on America's security." The White House contact man at Chicago, Robert Merriam, was instructed to pass the word around the Platform Committee that Newport was watching. And on arrival in Chicago, Mr. Eisenhower made personal telephone ap-

"In times of crisis, the newspapers are first with the cry: 'Let the people know the facts!' But perhaps Fact is a deity invoked by the people only in the last emergency when the easy gods of peace have failed them."

- Dorothy L. Sayers, 1941

"Will the Real Richard Nixon Please Stand Up?"

"In a nutshell, the Acheson foreign policy resulted in war and the Eisenhower-Dulles policy resulted in peace." *– Mr. Nixon, October 13, 1958*

* * *

"[There is] pretty general agreement among candidates on foreign policy." *– Richard Nixon, July 24, 1960*

* * *

"Direct federal aid to private colleges and universities is both unlikely and in many respects undesirable." *– Mr. Nixon, May 11, 1957*

* * *

"For higher education: grants-in-aid for such buildings as classrooms and laboratories . . . and inauguration of a program of federal scholarships for the most able undergraduates." *– Nixon-Rockefeller statement, July 23, 1960*

* * *

"The Eisenhower [farm] program is working and will continue to work because it cuts right to the heart of the problem. It is reducing surpluses . . . through the Soil Bank program and . . . through increasing markets for farm products." *– Mr. Nixon, October 12, 1956*

* * *

"There is no higher legislative priority than a complete overhauling of obsolete farm programs under which the prices farmers receive for major farm products continue to go down and the costs to the taxpayer continue to go up." *– Mr. Nixon, January 27, 1960*

* * *

"[Nixon] has shown his real mind at last." *– Joseph Alsop, July 25, 1960*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peals to Platform Committee Chairman Charles Percy and Defense Subcommittee Chairman Glenard Lipscomb, among others, employing language strong enough to send these gentlemen in search of hideaways where they might get out of the Eisenhower-Nixon line of fire.

Mr. Nixon agreed to press for a strengthened defense plank (in addition to a tougher civil rights plank) when Governor Rockefeller indicated in a telephone conversation shortly before 1 a.m. on Tuesday that he would feel compelled to attack the existing draft on the convention floor. Actually, Rockefeller had not decided to do any such thing. But he bargained hard to get a defense plank incorporating the commitment to increased expenditures which Nixon had accepted in the manifesto of Fifth Avenue. Thus the final language of the GOP plank on defense has quite as much of a sense of urgency as the Democratic plank, affirming that "intensified and courageous efforts are necessary" in the Sixties and pledging to "accelerate as necessary" our missile program as well as "to provide any necessary increased expenditures to meet new situations."

Although the President agreed in the end to the strengthened defense plank, his concurrence was given only with the greatest reluctance after the Vice President had already shown him, in effect, who was now party boss. He left Chicago in something of a huff. Mr. Nixon's anxiety lest the rift widen was evident in the fact that defense was given all of three sentences in his acceptance speech; the President's address to the convention was, by contrast, one long polemic in rebuttal to critics of his defense policy – including, by implication, the Vice President and Governor Rockefeller. It will be Nixon's hope, no doubt, that the calendar of the coming Congressional session will be too crowded to permit the intrusion of the defense issue. But we doubt that the Democratic leaders will pass by what is their greatest campaign opportunity to embarrass the Vice President. Should Mr. Nixon attempt to keep in step with the Democrats on any proposals for increased defense spending, he would risk an open break with the White House. As it is, the most significant event of the convention may well be that he did go as far as he did in asserting his independence of the President.

What the Platforms Say

With several notable exceptions, the Republican platform does not conform to the spirit or the letter of the Nixon-Rockefeller manifesto of July 23. For the sake mainly of New York's 45 electoral votes, Mr. Nixon needed a way to dull the image of a "liberal" Rockefeller arrayed against a young-fogey Nixon. Rockefeller needed a way out of the political corner into which he had painted himself with anti-Nixon attacks that left him no plausible reason for giving even nominal support to the GOP ticket this fall. The manifesto of Fifth Avenue provided the appearance of unity both needed.

The one major area in which the Platform does echo the Nixon-Rockefeller manifesto is national defense. But Nixon fought for platform revisions on defense only when Rockefeller threatened a floor fight. Even after days of huffing and puffing by the Nixon forces, the civil rights plank finally adopted does not explicitly "express support for the objectives of the sit-in demonstrators," as the Nixon-Rockefeller statement said it would. Instead GOP platform drafters "reaffirm the constitutional right to peaceable assembly to protest discrimination in private business establishments." In contrast to the Democratic pledge for a national FEPC, the GOP speaks of expanding the work of the Presidential committee (which Nixon has headed) assuring job equality under federal contracts. (Textual excerpts of the platforms are compared on pages 10 and 11.)

Economic growth most clearly separates not only Nixon and Rockefeller but the two parties. The Democrats state that "our economy can and must grow at an average rate of five percent annually." The Nixon-Rockefeller statement has some of the same affirmative quality in declaring that "the rate of our economic growth must, as promptly as possible, be accelerated by policies and programs stimulating our free enterprise system"; the statement concludes that "as the Vice President pointed out in a speech in 1958, the achievement of a five percent rate of growth would produce an additional $10 billion of tax revenue in 1962." Mr. Nixon himself, however, was quick to stress when asked later whether his goal was a five percent growth rate that "I would not say that was my goal. I think the only proper goal of those who do not buy the theory of government-manipulated growth is a maximum growth rate. I do not believe that it is appropriate, proper or feasible to set an arbitrary rate." And the platform argues that "a healthy climate" in the private enterprise sector is all that the US needs to get "vigorous economic growth. . . . We reject the concept of artificial growth forced by massive new federal spending."

On foreign policy the two parties also sharply differ: the Democrats specifically promise to give foreign economic aid long-term financing and to downgrade military aid "as rapidly as security considerations permit." The Republicans defend military aid and say nothing of long-term financing. Nixon and Rockefeller had urged US leadership in forming confederations "in all great regions of the free world," including North Atlantic and Western Hemisphere groupings in which the US would presumably have membership. This was quite a mouthful for Midwestern GOP diehards to swallow, and so the platform avoids use of the word "confederations" and bypasses altogether the Western Hemisphere. There is a minor concession to Rockefeller in the suggestion that the US encourage regional eco-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic groupings in the underdeveloped areas, offering its "cooperation in planning and the provision of technical personnel" (not, one may note, in the provision of development capital).

In their little-noticed planks on world trade the two parties clearly show a traditional conflict which assumes new importance at a time of increasing foreign imports and heightened protectionist sentiment. The Democrats talk of helping trade-affected industries and communities through trade adjustment measures such as direct loans and tax incentives. The Republicans want "effective administration of the [Trade Agreements] Act's peril point and escape clause provisions to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury" – in essence, the same old high-tariff party line of McKinley's day.

Brotherly Help for the Congo

Although Dag Hammarskjold encountered many frustrations during his meetings with the Congolese Government in Leopoldville, there is cautiously rising hope, notwithstanding the latest threat by the Soviet Union, that it may be possible for the United Nations to reshape the Congo's whirling particles into a workable dough. Increasingly, however, it is being recognized that the UN has far more on its hands than a police action: the Congo is a major salvage operation that could take a decade and will certainly require many millions of dollars. In effect, the UN appears to be falling heir to the task of doing what Belgium, for lack of the imperial mystique of either Britain or France, deliberately failed to do – prepare a hand to which the torch of responsibility could be safely passed.

The mutiny of *Force Publique* having about run its course, General von Horn and his motley army are gradually gaining military control of the five provinces outside Katanga. Although communications among the widely-dispersed UN units is reportedly still disturbingly irregular, the top officers of General von Horn's command have obviously been chosen because they know a good deal more than rote military technique. The Moroccan marching bands, the green-jacketed Irish on dress parade, and Ghanaian troops' Buckingham Palace style changes-of-the-guard before Premier Lumumba's residence have accomplished some near-miracles in winning over both Congolese civilians and troops.

Mr. Hammarskjold can conceivably detail to technicians the solution of the immediate crises posed by the inadequate food supply, the thousands of irritable jobless, the breakdown in public services, and the absence of operating funds for the Congolese Government. But the major political headache remains his alone to solve – what to do about the impasse between Moise Tshombe's Katanga and Premier Lumumba's unitary-minded government in Leopoldville. A Hammarskjold-devised compromise appears to be in the works, which will save Mr. Tshombe's face, but will, in effect, doom his project by calling for the gradual departure of the Belgian troops on which his attractive but anachronistic regime depends.

If Mr. Lumumba – the UN chief's other imponderable – seemed somewhat more rational and consistent in Washington and New York than he was the previous fortnight in the Congo, the basic reason would seem to be that his position is less desperate. First, he had found time to get some sleep on the trip over. Secondly, his threats to call in the Soviets had accomplished their purpose – the UN was now committed to getting Belgian troops "speedily" out of the country. Thirdly, he had reason to believe that the UN was going to bring the rich Katanga back under the jurisdiction of his central government. Fourthly, his domestic position, though still tenuous, was looking better. Despite the increasingly violent language of his many critics, the specific parliamentary elements on which he bases his regime have held firm. Perhaps most important of all, he had stopped off in Ghana en route to listen receptively to some hard-headed advice from his political model, President Nkrumah.

If Prime Minister Lumumba does develop his natural but undisciplined political gifts into a coherent whole, history will probably give much of the credit for polishing the edges to Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria, Liberia and other African states which have rallied to protect him from his own inexperience and naïveté. The Soviet threats to intervene directly in the Congo are as unnerving in Accra and Lagos as in New York, and have had much to do with catalyzing Africa's constructive support of the UN mission. The resources development deal with promoter J. Edgar Detwiler further convinced African leaders that Lumumba needed some practical brotherly advice that he would accept only from them. Ghana, among others, has moved quickly to establish a strong diplomatic mission in Leopoldville, and Lumumba was constantly surrounded by Ghanaian and Guinean advisors in both the United States and Canada.

All this suggests that if the UN succeeds – even partially – in putting the Congo back on its feet, there will be other marginal gains besides the revitalization of the General Assembly and the neutralization of a potential East-West battlefield. Mr. Lumumba's neighbors are determined to prove that the collapse of this particular republic is not a reflection of any generalized African inadequacy, and they have thus joined the Congo bucket brigade with a special sense of purpose. Since Africa may have as many as 20 votes in the General Assembly by 1961, the emergence of this new attitude of responsibility for making the UN work could be a very important Rubicon indeed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OVERHEATED ATMOSPHERE IN HAVANA AND WASHINGTON

Keeping Cool About Cuba

Havana

Cuban-American relations have now deteriorated to that unfortunate state in which both sides wilfully misunderstand and misinterpret the other's actions. The Cuban Government, for example, mistakenly believes that the quite understandable refusal of American export companies to grant the usual 90-day commercial credits is an act of economic sabotage ordered by the State Department; every American troop movement in the Caribbean is interpreted as evidence that the Marines are about ready to land. The US, on the other hand, has chosen to regard a sensible business deal (the exchange of Cuban sugar for Russian crude oil at a price 70 cents below the world market) as evidence that the Castro regime has become a full-fledged satellite of the USSR.

One result of this overheated atmosphere was our cut in the sugar quota, an act which harmed both countries and benefited the Soviet Union. Cuba's precariously balanced economy and her strained foreign reserve position have been seriously hurt by the loss of $70 million in dollars; the US will have to pay somewhat more for its sugar, and stands to lose much of the remaining $300 million a year export trade to the island. Worse still has been the wave of anti-Americanism touched off by Washington's unilateral action even in such normally pro-US countries as Argentina, Venezuela and Mexico.

Recent calming statements by Secretary Herter and Henry Cabot Lodge concerning US military intentions have helped clear the air; Philip Bonsal, our Ambassador in Havana, has kept his temper despite the frequently exasperating behavior of the government to which he is accredited. Given the unfortunate history of American interference in Cuba over the past 60 years, and the clash of Castro's reform program with American business interests in the island, the new region was bound to display a considerable amount of anti-US sentiment no matter what this country did. But Cuba's revolution, despite its dependence on Soviet aid for survival, continues to be understandable as a nationalist movement; Castro and his men gladly accept Khrushchev's help, but they are neither dupes nor willing tools of the USSR. Outside the heated imaginations of some American reporters, there is no Soviet secret army hidden on the island, no rocket bases concealed in the Sierra Maestra, and no evidence that Castro is being pressured to sign a mutual defense treaty during K's forthcoming visit. Economic pressure or military threats from the US will only make these possibilities more likely by driving the Cuban Government into Russian arms.

As there simply is no feasible way to overthrow the present regime, it is to be hoped that the Administration will refrain from any further futile action or talk about "getting tough" with Castro. His government is here to stay, and we will have to get used to it, much as the USSR has grown accustomed to living with Yugoslavia. A change of Administrations next January will enable us to take a fresh look at the whole troublesome situation; the next President will have to use a lot more tact, skill and imagination if he is to extricate us from the real potential dangers we face both in Cuba and throughout the rest of Latin America.

Samuel Shapiro

LATIN AMERICAN REACTIONS TO US DIPLOMACY

Playing Castro's Game

Mexico City

Quite suddenly, Castro's stock has gone up. He has made the United States angry enough, and careless enough, to give the impression that Washington equates Cuban reforms with Communist imperialism. Latin Americans happen to be in favor of Castro's agrarian reforms, and they are bored at the very thought of Communist imperialism. Furthermore, "expropriation" is a pleasant word hereabouts. So Washington may yet make a hero out of the bearded fanatic.

If we were secretly bent on glorifying Castro we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could do it by adhering to a few simple rules:

1. Arrange the timing of all punitive measures against Cuba so that they follow the confiscation of American property – especially oil property.

2. Proceed on the assumption that Latin Americans will naturally side with the US against other Latin Americans. If this does not happen, evince hurt and surprise.

3. While US owners are smarting from financial losses in Cuba, issue warnings against a Communist beachhead there. If possible, substantiate these with futuristic details, such as Soviet submarine bases.

4. Disregard – or better still, remain ignorant of – the internal pressures operating within neighboring friendly governments. Expect all Latin American statesmen, faced by the threat of Communist imperialism, to stand united with their own rival politicians, their own ambitious union chiefs, and their own left-wing students.

This formula is not theoretical. It has already worked quite well in Mexico, and its effects are spreading south.

Shortly after the US Government slashed Cuban sugar imports, a Mexican deputy rose to address a packed room at the National Palace. The deputy was Emilio Sanchez Piedras, president of the Permanent Congressional Committee. He was speaking for the ruling Party of Revolutionary Institutions and, indirectly, for President Adolfo Lopez Mateos. "In this moment of crisis," he said, ". . . when our neighbor to the north has closed the door of friendship and understanding on the yearnings of the Cuban people . . . we reiterate our solidarity with the Cuban people . . ." and so on. The declaration brought Senators and Deputies to their feet in one of the longest ovations on record.

Less spectacular but perhaps more significant was a written statement published at the same time by ex-President Lazaro Cardenas. Cardenas, though no implacable enemy of Moscow or Peking, is Mexico's greatest popular hero. He, too, plunked for Cuba against the United States.

It was a bad day for US Ambassador Robert C. Hill. From his Mexico City rostrum Mr. Hill had long been denouncing Castro. He had long been advocating a decrease in the Cuban sugar quota and an increase in the Mexican. Now it had happened, but Mexico seemed to be shrugging off the sugar profits and backing Castro. Was this official? Mr. Hill sought out Foreign Secretary Manuel Tello to learn how official it was. The interview, as Sr. Tello later described it, was "cordial"; the American Embassy issued a statement denying that Mr. Hill had been nervous and describing him as "satisfied." The embassy spokesman also pointed out somewhat anxiously that Sr. Tello had sat in Mr. Hill's box at a concert following the meeting.

But side by side with accounts of Sr. Tello's cordiality to Mr. Hill, newspapers carried accounts of Sr. Tello's cordiality to a certain visiting party of Uruguayans and Peruvians. The leader of the Uruguayan delegation, Alejandro Zorilla de San Martin, president of the Legislative Congress of Uruguay, told reporters he was sorry about the Cuban-American trouble but that his country of course supported Cuban reforms. Dr. Ricardo Elias Aparicio of Peru stressed his nation's fraternal ties with Cuba and voiced the hope that the next Administration in the United States would pursue a more realistic Latin American policy.

With all this happening, and much more of the same, there was little comfort in the "clarification" that Foreign Secretary Tello finally vouchsafed Ambassador Hill after days of delay. "Expressions by members of Congress," Sr. Tello said, "do not commit the executive, nor do they necessarily reflect his opinions." In government circles now there is an almost compassionate curiosity whether Mr. Hill and the United States have actually swallowed this whole.

The government could not, of course, repudiate the Congressman without repudiating General Cardenas. That would have been something akin to political suicide, because Cardenas became the national hero he is by expropriating American oil companies.

The Cardenas statement merits examination, not only for its political significance, but possibly also for some wisdom it may contain. After denouncing something called "economic aggression against Cuba," Cardenas asks: "Why raise fears that Cuba could become a Soviet military base? If world war unfortunately breaks out the Soviet Union will not need Cuba. The two antagonistic military blocks . . . possess extraordinary long-range weapons of destruction. Thus, military bases deemed necessary years ago are useless today. . . . And it is wrong to stimulate the fear of Communist infiltration by resorting to absurd measures that hurt the feelings of the people. We call for serenity, which alone can lead to a solution. . . ."

So far, one of the serenest notes above the border was sounded by Sen. John F. Kennedy. In an interview that got banner headlines here, Kennedy told a Mexican reporter: "I would be in no hurry to withdraw recognition from any constituted government, no matter how offensive its methods or points of view. . . . The policy of non-intervention must be applied not only in the areas of politics and diplomacy, but in business as well." That statement heightened the lively interest already felt here in "the next Administration."

"Latin America," Kennedy continued, "must not be a paradise for mediocre ambassadors . . . who avoid contact with the leaders of the future. . . . I refer to workers, students, small businessmen and members of the growing middle class."

More of that sort of language would make Latin America listen seriously to the US once again.

Ralph Winnett

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Excerpts from the Platforms of the *Democratic*

CIVIL RIGHTS

If discrimination in voting, education, the administration of justice or segregated lunch-counters are the issues in one area, discrimination in housing and employment may be pressing questions elsewhere. The peaceful demonstrations for first-class citizenship which have recently taken place in many parts of this country are a signal to all of us to make good at long last the guarantees of our Constitution.

We will support whatever action is necessary to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting. We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

For this and for the protection of all other Constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil rights on grounds of race, creed, or color.

The new Democratic Administration will support federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission effectively to secure for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

This is the strength that must be erected: Deterrent military power such that the Soviet and Chinese leaders will have no doubt that an attack on the United States would surely be followed by their own destruction; balanced conventional military forces which will permit a response graded to the intensity of any threats of aggressive force; continuous modernization of these forces through intensified research and development, including essential programs now slowed down, terminated, suspended, or neglected for lack of budgetary support.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

We Democrats believe that our economy can and must grow at an average rate of 5 percent annually, almost twice as fast as our average annual rate since 1953. We pledge ourselves to policies that will achieve this goal without inflation. Economic growth is the means whereby we improve the American standard of living and produce added tax resources for national security and essential public services. . . . As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high interest, tight money policy.

Inflation has its roots in a variety of causes; its cure lies in a variety of remedies. Among those remedies are monetary and credit policies properly applied, budget surpluses in times of full employment, and action to restrain "administered price" increases in industries where economic power rests in the hands of a few.

THE UNDERDEVELOPED WORLD

The new Democratic Administration will revamp and refocus the objectives, emphasis and allocation of our foreign assistance programs. The proper purpose of these programs is not to buy gratitude or to recruit mercenaries, but to enable the peoples of these awakening, developing nations to make their own free choice.

Where military assistance remains essential for the common defense, we shall see that the requirements are fully met. But as rapidly as security considerations permit, we will replace tanks with tractors, bombers with bull-dozers, and tacticians with technicians.

We recognize India and Pakistan as major tests of the capacity of free men in a difficult environment to master the age-old problems of illiteracy, poverty, and disease. We will support their efforts in every practical way.

The Democratic Administration will recognize that assistance to these countries is not an emergency or short-term matter. Through the Development Loan Fund and otherwise, we shall seek to assure continuity in our aid programs for periods of at least five years.

WORLD TRADE

World trade raises living standards, widens markets, reduces costs, increases profits, and builds political stability and international economic cooperation. The increase in foreign imports involves costly adjustment and damage to some domestic industries and communities. . . . Trade-affected industries and communities need and deserve appropriate help through trade adjustment measures such as direct loans, tax incentives, defense contracts priority, and retraining assistance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Parties–How They Compare

Republican

CIVIL RIGHTS

We oppose the pretense of fixing a target date three years from now for the mere submission of plans for school desegregation. Slow-moving school districts would construe it as a three-year moratorium during which progress would cease, postponing until 1963 the legal process to enforce compliance. We believe that each of the pending court actions should proceed as the Supreme Court has directed and that in no district should there be any such delay. We pledge: legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a state-accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting; continued support for legislation to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity to make permanent and to expand with legislative backing the excellent work being performed by the President's Committee on Government Contracts; our best efforts to change the present Rule 22 of the Senate and other appropriate Congressional procedures that often make unattainable proper legislative implementation of constitutional guarantees.

We reaffirm the constitutional right to peaceable assembly to protest discrimination in private business establishments. We applaud the action of the businessmen who have abandoned discriminatory practices . . . and we urge others to follow their example.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Swift technological change and the warning signs of Soviet aggressiveness make clear that intensified and courageous efforts are necessary, for the new problems of the 1960's will of course demand new efforts on the part of our entire nation. Maintenance of [the strategic imperatives of our national defense policy] requires these actions: development and production of new strategic weapons such as the Polaris submarine and ballistic missile; accelerate, as necessary, development of hardening, mobility, dispersal, and production programs for long-range missiles and the speedy perfection of new and advanced generations of missiles and anti-missile missiles.

There is no price ceiling on America's security. The United States can and must provide whatever is necessary to insure its own security and that of the free world, to provide any necessary increased expenditures to meet new situations. . . .

ECONOMIC GROWTH

We accord high priority to vigorous economic growth and recognize that its mainspring lies in the private sector of the economy. We must continue to foster a healthy climate in that sector. We reject the concept of artificial growth forced by massive new federal spending and loose money policies. The only effective way to accelerate economic growth is to increase the traditional strengths of our free economy – initiative and investment, productivity and efficiency. To that end we favor: broadly-based tax reform to foster job-making and growth-making investment for modernization and expansion, including realistic incentive depreciation schedules; use of the full powers of government to prevent the scourge of depression and inflation; elimination of featherbedding practices by labor and business; maintenance of a stable dollar as an indispensable means to progress. . . .

THE UNDERDEVELOPED WORLD

We will encourage the countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia to initiate appropriate regional groupings to work out plans for economic and educational development. We anticipate that the United Nations Special Fund would be of assistance in developing such plans. The United States would offer its cooperation in planning and the provision of technical personnel for this purpose. . . . We would emphasize the increasing use of private capital and government loans, rather than outright grants, as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect.

We believe military assistance to our allies under the mutual security program should be continued with all the vigor and funds needed to maintain the strength of our alliances at levels essential to our common safety.

WORLD TRADE

We favor: Carrying forward, under the Trade Agreements Act, the policy of gradual, selective – and truly reciprocal – reduction of unjustifiable barriers to trade among free nations. We advocate effective administration of the Act's escape clause and peril point provisions to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burroughs Against IBM

As McAuliffe said at Bastogne, "Nuts!"

To a superficial observer, lacking any inside information, it is the obvious comment on the pending Presidential campaign. You will remember that McAuliffe was at the time in what Madison Avenue delicately describes as a negative situation. He was cut off, surrounded, and attacked on all sides by mechanized forces; and that, precisely, is the position of the realist in American politics in this year of grace.

Whether the realist is radical or reactionary, liberal or conservative, matters not at all. Barry Goldwater and Adlai Stevenson are equally in a negative situation and for the same reason – each wanted his party committed to something. They wanted different things, but both were for taking a definite, comprehensible and consistent line, and both are licked.

Two national conventions, each as phony as a $3 bill, have presented two candidates, for neither of whom is there any perceptible enthusiasm except among extreme sectaries because neither has demonstrated any particular qualification for the Presidency other than a masterly ability to produce an alibi in every specific case. But we have had Alibi Ike in the White House for eight years, so the prognosis is no change for the better.

Nuts!

It does not necessarily follow, however, that the campaign will be a bore. On the contrary, it offers every promise of being one of the most amusing in history, and there is a possibility that it may be highly instructive. We are about to witness a double-barreled demonstration by the greatest experts in the world of the type of stage-magic known as the build-up. That it will be a success admits of no reasonable doubt, and it may be a success so prodigious as to eclipse the similar operation in 1840, when the issue of hard cider against gold spoons produced an uproar never evoked by any other issue, not excluding the Dred Scott Decision, the Cross of Gold, and the Promise of a New Deal.

The issue this year, like the winning candidate, will be a creation of the imagination of the advertising men, so it does not yet appear in its full glory; but in essence it will be the political equivalent of Burroughs against IBM, a combat of the calculating machines. It will be depicted as Armageddon, where the Hosts of Darkness are arrayed against the Hosts of Light; but its outcome will depend, not on the clash of ideas, but on the neat and accurate adjustment of ratchets, cams and cog-wheels. For two superb mechanicians face each other, and in every such case superior manipulation of the screwdriver tells the tale.

The eventual winner? Oh, John Tyler, of course. What name he will bear is as yet unknown but the name is immaterial, for the character and conduct of the winner must to some extent parallel those of the sour Virginian. The first necessity of the new occupant of the White House will be the political decapitation of Henry Clay, represented by Stevenson, if Kennedy is the new President, or by Rockefeller, if it is Nixon. Then will come the job of bringing to heel any contemporary Daniel Webster (Humphrey? Javits? Fulbright? Goldwater?). This was beyond the capacity of the original John Tyler, but both Kennedy and Nixon are much more skillful politicians.

Thereafter will come the job of constructing a political machine more compact than the ponderous, fin-tailed, unmanageable contraptions currently existing. This was utterly beyond the first Tyler and will be, I am happy to believe, beyond his successor. Tyler had only one foundation on which to build a party, hatred of Andrew Jackson, and it was not solid enough. Hatred of Truman is not available to either Kennedy or Nixon, because they share it; and in any event it is not enough. For the rest – well, "the rest is silence." It is thus in the cards that the final outcome of the election of 1960 may be the disintegration and disappearance of the party that corrals the majority of the electoral votes.

This may be deplorable but in view of the fact that neither party at present stands for anything realistic, some of us can view it with equanimity and accordingly are prepared to enjoy every minute of the impending spectacle. By November we may be able even to work up a satisfactory frenzy. That seems improbable at the moment, when the realist, like Chaucer's non-enthusiast, tends to view the race "with an eye no moister than a too-long opened oyster"; but mass hysteria is capable of producing marvels. What with torchlight, fireworks, and a stirring marching cadence, it is possible to work up enthusiasm for a dead mackerel, nay, for a Nixon or a Kennedy. At least we may hope for the best, and it is a fine thing to be filled with enthusiasm in late October; we may yet find ourselves surging through the streets bawling, "Tippecanoe and Tyler too!" Nuts!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Generation That Waited

Tennessee Williams in a short story describes the moral attitude of a character: "(She) is also capable of fury, but she reserves it for the true beast which she knows by sight, sound, and smell, and although she has no name for it, she knows it is the beast of mendacity in us, the beast that tells mean lies. . . ."

The movement for Adlai Stevenson had that kind of fury in it. It came at a time when political action, especially among students, was a thing of the past. It was a movement with little hope for success. Its members were mostly young and partially old. In some cases they wore beards, carried babies in their arms, painted their own signs and gave their time and money without reward. It was unlike the two prior Stevenson campaigns. In its brief moment, it raised more genuine laughter and tears, in an era of public opinion polls, organization men and canned applause, than the students of my generation have ever known.

To understand the meaning of this movement and its causes, it is illuminating to consider the impact of these last fifteen years on my generation. It has been almost numbed by such events as the torture and murder of millions of people by the Nazis, the American bombing of Hiroshima, the depiction of the Russians as cruel barbarians preparing to attack us, the McCarthy witch-hunt, the semi-slave status of the Negro in the South, and the revelations of Premier Khrushchev about the terrible crimes of Stalin's last years. These events, in brutal succession over a few years, have made it extremely difficult for the American student to take any interest in "causes" for human betterment and justice. So many lies have been told, so many millions of lives have been casually yet brutally snuffed out, that no student will readily take anyone's word for anything. Therein arises the first, prevalent attitude: Is any side right? Then there is the harrassment of so many Americans whose views differ in any fundamental way from those of the government. Congressional investigating committees, loyalty oaths, the firing of hundreds of teachers, the tapping of telephones and the activity of the FBI – all of these pressures for conformity have made it clear to the student how much meaning democracy has in our time.

While it knows little of the rest of the world, my generation knows that within its own experience, there is very little to be hoped for in terms of human progress. I do not agree with this view, but I feel it deserves respect. It is a view that comes from the stench in the air of gas ovens and a mountain of corpses, and a climate of intimidation and repression of human rights and liberties. It culminated in the beatnik, symbolic of the withdrawal of American youth from reality.

But beginning with the sit-ins of the Negro students in the South, followed by the heroic demonstrations against the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, and culminating in the nationwide draft movement for Stevenson (both a student and adult movement), at least a noticeable section of American youth seems to be finally shaking itself free and declaring itself *still* on the side of human justice and freedom. We don't know exactly where human justice resides these days, and so we do not attach ourselves to any particular political party. This generation cannot stomach abstract slogans or theories. It is directing its fire at what it can *see*, and what it sees is the "true Beast." It has confronted segregation and political inquisitions, and finally it began to confront the threat of nuclear war by supporting the candidacy of Adlai Stevenson.

We rallied around Stevenson this past month because he exemplified in every way the qualities of the truly concerned person about the problems that face us. Instead of speaking confidently and glibly about every conceivable subject, instead of having the answers to everything, he almost went to the other extreme. He was calm, meditative, almost unable to give a "straight" answer about anything. He shared our doubts about the rightness of any particular side – and he shared our caution in making up his mind. He took one thing at a time – on the question of peace, he was forthright: the enemy was not primarily the Soviet military threat. The enemy was war.

His answers seemed right to us, and so did his doubts. He spoke about the things that mattered, and his mode of expression was one of someone who had spent his life pondering the eternal questions of man's relation to himself, to his country and perhaps to his God. He seemed to rekindle an understanding of our democratic heritage – of tolerance and true compassion.

The movement for Adlai Stevenson suffered a practical defeat and yet won a partial victory. In the noisy emptiness of the convention, with all its banality and – yes, mendacity – the voice of at least some of my generation made itself heard in a thundering, hysterical, triumphant half-hour demonstration that had moments of surprising eloquence. The most memorable moments came with the words of Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Minnesota): ". . . there was one who did not prophesy falsely, let me remind you. There was one man who said: Let's talk sense to the American people. . . .

"He said this is a time for greatness for America. He did not say he possessed it. He did not even say he was destined for it. He did say that the heritage of America is one of greatness. And he described that heritage to us. And he said the promise of America is a promise of greatness. And he said this promise we must fulfill. . . .

"Do not reject this man who made us all proud to be called Democrats. Do not reject this man who, his enemies said, spoke above the heads of the people, but they said it only because they didn't want the people to listen. . . ."

There was a portion of my generation there, laughing, crying, shouting and singing itself hoarse. They had waited a long time. The purity of their action seemed to justify that wait. DAVID EVANIER

Goodby, Conventions!

Presidential conventions are on their way out. Television is poking the cruel finger of reality into the half truths of American politics, and something must give. Yet before the convention passes into limbo with the steam caliope and the torchlight parade and the candidate's special train, let me have a sheet or two of yellow Western Union copy paper to try to compose a valentine to that part of it I know and love, the press sideshow to the main tent.

In a vast sub-basement of some hotel in the convention city is the tumultuous press room. To reach it you batter through badged crowds, pass suspicious cops and descend into a hall filled with clamor, smelling of circus and surrounded by free drink stands whose spurious libations are as saccharin and synthetic as party promises. The great chamber is curtained into big and little booths for individual newspapers. The curtains are always green. Instead of tanbark the floors are cluttered with torn newspapers, discarded Man-Who speeches and the third try of the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* to write a lead.

Chicago is *the* convention city. Here the Wigwam picked Lincoln, and Suite 408-9-10 of the Blackstone picked Harding; here FDR flew in while the band played "Happy Days," and here – yes, here too – I and my beloved telegrapher, Bert Pray, with his Morse key backed by Prince Albert can, shared a princely suite facing Lake Michigan, bartered for due-bills in the bankrupt thirties.

In this heady atmosphere a political reporter meets everybody he thinks worth knowing. Tokyo *Asahi* sits beside *Le Figaro;* British *Pic* and Paris *Match* jealously watch each other; an Oxford don takes notes; a bedazzled AP cub writes about the Connecticut delegation, and two oldtimers chant the warcry of their golden memories—"Twenty-fo' votes for Os-car W. UNDERWOOD!"

They live in a world larger than life, intoxicated by tickers, typewriters, TV announcers, and binding all together to rumors as a wheatfield nods to a breeze.

Yet it can't last; something is wrong. It is television. TV is trying to do two things – simplify the show into the values of a half hour Western, and make logical a process out of something which at heart is mystical. Maybe it can do the first; it can't the second. The trolley tracks of American government, when all is said and done, run off into the clouds of make-believe. In theory America has two parties which meet every four years and after mature deliberation select a Hannibal Hamlin and an Abe Lincoln. What delightful nonsense! Anybody can see that a folkmoot of 3,000 can't do this; yet if this isn't the process, what is? Television searches round and round; where does the trolley car get airborne? For generations the press fostered this make-believe, half credulous itself, living on snacks, hooch and excitement. But the camera is different.

Already the change begins. Never again will supporters of Woodrow Wilson start their 75-minute jamboree at 3:30 a.m. to outdo Champ Clark. TV streamlines speeches, demonstrations and the polling of delegations. Delegates are decorous (at least, GOP delegates) for Big Brother is watching. But there comes the point of no return.

Streamline them as you will, conventions are not entertainment; explain them as you try, they are not logical. The attempt to make a show out of it – above all to make sense out of it – requires not a new communications medium but a new convention. The present convention is at heart an irrationality that, oddly enough, works.

Till a substitute develops, however, haggard men will try to reduce what happens to writing for 2 a.m. deadlines. They know that at some point in the affair history will touch a politician who seemed reasonably commonplace before. No matter how certain the outcome or drab the person the ceremony is still strangely moving. Lo, the trolley car bounds skyward!

And these drugged and dragged-out newsmen will respond as they always do, in a fashion that somehow justifies them. Typewriters rattle, boys rush copy and make the absurd decision to become journalists, and the reporters fight the deadlines with the skill and stamina of men who have led better lives. Yes, the convention is fading – the brown metal box is killing it. But what fun it was! TRB

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OVERSEAS BASES

Do Spy Flights Imperil US Alliances?

by Thomas R. Phillips

In the days between May 1, when the U-2 high altitude reconnaissance airplane crashed, or was shot down, and May 5, when the Soviets announced it, it is not hard to reconstruct the continuous policy discussions in the Kremlin to decide what line to take. If an international issue was made, it would have to be admitted that an American airplane had penetrated 1,300 miles inside the Soviet Union before it was downed. The world, including the Russian and satellite people, would deduce that Soviet defenses were not effective against American aircraft. But if the flight, and the capture of the pilot and the recovery of the plane, was made public, it would give the Russians a propaganda weapon of high credibility in their campaign against American overseas bases. It would also furnish a lever to pry apart American alliances, particularly among small allies and neutrals. Unfortunately, no such careful planning of moves was made in the United States.

The decision to make the flight public was taken. There is little doubt that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev expected that President Eisenhower would disown and condemn the flight over the Soviet Union. Indeed, he said in an address May 28 to the All-Union Labor Conference in Moscow: "We seriously considered the situation which had arisen and nevertheless decided not to undertake anything which would prevent the US President from extricating himself from this absurdly stupid situation he had got himself into. We even stated that the President was not likely to have known or approved such actions and that hotheads in the Pentagon and Allen Dulles, that professional spy, were apparently to blame. But Eisenhower did not take the opportunity offered to him and declared that the spy flights had been approved by him and were taking place with his knowledge. I am still of the opinion that he did not know. But he, as President, found it awkward to admit that he did not know what was going on in his country. . . . The President will not agree with this, but the whole world knows that he has two duties: One is to play golf, and the other is the Presidential duty. Which is more important? The golf is the main one, and the Presidential duty is the secondary one."

The Kremlin chess players, in plotting their moves, had anticipated, in consonance with the protocol of espionage, that Eisenhower would disown and condemn the espionage flights over the Soviet Union. But Presidential press secretary James C. Hagerty insisted that the President should take the responsibility since the public image of the President as not knowing what was going on could not be permitted.

Khrushchev was angry with the President. Had the U-2 incident been disavowed, he would have had a cause against American bases and he could have maintained that the first overflight of the Soviet Union had been shot down. He would have had his base issue, but he would not have been exposed as a dupe of Eisenhower, whom he had advertised to the world as a man of peace with whom he could deal. Rather, Eisenhower would have been the dupe. It was necessary to show his contempt for the man whom he had advertised as one he could work with for peace. The Khrushchev policy of dealing with Eisenhower had not been unanimously accepted in the Kremlin and Khrushchev was in trouble. He had to disown President Eisenhower and his dealings with him.

It was predictable, after the U-2 incident, that the Soviets would take advantage of any occasion to shoot down an American airplane flying near the Soviet frontier. They needed more incidents to bolster the campaign against American bases. The occasion came July 1, two months after the U-2 crashed, when an RB-47, a reconnaissance version of the B-47 bomber, approached the Kola Peninsula. It was shot down. Two crew members were captured, the body of the first pilot was recovered and three of the six-man crew were missing.

Undoubtedly, the RB-47 flight, and others like it that are going on several times weekly from overseas bases, are, as the Soviet radio asserted, being made for the purpose of locating and mapping Soviet radar defenses. The purpose of the Soviet Union in shooting down the

---

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS R. PHILLIPS *(Ret.) is military analyst of the* St. Louis Post-Dispatch *and author of many books and articles on national security policy. He recently returned from a month-long, 27,000-mile tour of United States military installations and programs in the Far East and Southeast Asia.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RB-47 was to stop such probes of its air defenses (there is no question but that the airplane was over international waters when it was intercepted) and also again to pillory the United States as using its overseas bases against the Soviet Union.

There have been about 75 American lives lost in flights along Communist frontiers on such reconnaissance missions. There is a legitimate question whether the United States gains more by such probes than it loses. Constant probing keeps Soviet air defenses on the alert and gives them practice that could not be obtained in any other fashion. It gives the Soviet Union a propaganda weapon against the United States and its overseas bases. It subjects the small nations on the periphery of the Soviet Union to threats that endanger the alliances we have made.

It is questionable that the intelligence gained is worth the risks and cost.

The major risk is the loss of overseas bases. How important are they?

There is a sophisticated school of thought holding that military alliances, with the concomitant base rights, have an injurious effect and feed anti-Americanism; that Communist subversion, feeding on anti-Americanism, is the greater danger. It is no doubt true that American bases in a foreign country and the presence of American troops creates a political issue that is capitalized by political parties not in power. This is true wherever – Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Norway, Great Britain – democratic institutions permit dissent to be expressed.

But the hard facts are that the defense of our small allies around the world cannot be undertaken without bases. The least concerned of the services is the Air Force. The overseas bases of the Strategic Air Command have long since been relegated to refueling and post-strike recovery. SAC has been increasing its inventory of tankers so that it does not have to depend upon overseas bases. They are useful, helpful, but not vital. They are too close to Soviet or Communist territory to risk stationing precious SAC bombers on them. European and African SAC bases are used today only for alert units that stay not more than two weeks before they are rotated and which are on continuous 15-minute alert.

The Army problem, to fly troops to critical areas in an emergency, cannot be resolved by jet tankers. Troops must be airlifted to nearby areas by long-range strategic airlift and then move into the combat zone by assault airlift in airplanes from which airborne troops can be dropped or landed on unimproved airfields.

The transfer and inflight air bases for overseas troop movement by air cannot be dispensed with. If the United States had not had the air base at Adana, Turkey, it could not have sent airborne troops to Lebanon. If it does not have a base in the Philippines, it cannot send airborne troops to South Vietnam, Laos or Thailand.

The Navy can operate in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean without bases, although the refueling points in Spain and Italy are important. But in the Far East, 7,000 miles from the Pacific Coast, the forward bases at Yokosuka, Japan, and Subic Bay in the Philippines are vital. If Yokosuka were lost, the United States would have to give up its forward strategy in the Far East. It would require from two and one-half to three times as many ships in the Pacific fleet to maintain the naval and marine forces in the area of the Far East as now are required.

If any of the air bases in Japan, Okinawa or the Philippines were lost, there is no place to put the tactical air forces that now are stationed at these bases. They would have to be withdrawn to Hawaii or to the United States. With them would go the 15,000 Marines on Okinawa, our Far East fire brigade. Actually, there is a desperate need to move the 25th Infantry Division from Hawaii to the Philippines to be readily available for use in Southeast Asia, but the base is not available and is not likely to be.

Some bases can be dispensed with. Guantanamo, for example, once was strategically important. Today it is a training support base and would be useful, but not vital, for anti-submarine warfare in the Caribbean in time of war. But Roosevelt Roads base at the eastern end of Puerto Rico and the base at Trinidad can replace it. The United States has an investment of $65 million in Guantanamo and would have to spend considerably to improve Roosevelt Roads. But if Guantanamo becomes untenable due to Cuban sensitivity, it can be given up. The loss of its local payroll of $7 million annually would hurt Cuba more than the loss of the base would hurt the United States.

The United States base problem is not simple and straight-forward. The United States cannot live up to its overseas commitments, particularly in the Far East, without the bases it now has. Korea cannot be defended without bases in Japan and Japan becomes less defensible without Korea. Japan will never be able again to defend itself with its own resources. Without Far East bases, the United States is helpless to defend its Far Eastern, Southeast Asian and South Asian allies. Nor can we keep our commitments in the Near East without transit bases for airborne troop movements.

The real issue is not whether we should withdraw from overseas bases, but rather whether we should refrain from giving the Soviet Union, by our use of these bases for intelligence purposes in peacetime, the propaganda leverage to frighten our allies into withdrawing our privileges. They are more important to them than to us. Our intelligence operations have acquired a fictional importance far beyond reality.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Sources of "Elmer Gantry"

by James Benedict Moore

As early as December 27, 1925, Sinclair Lewis wrote to his publisher, Alfred Harcourt,

> "... as soon as I've had a good lay-off next summer ... I'll be ready to go at the next book.... It'll be, I think, either a lovely detective story I've enjoyed planning, or the big religious novel I've planned so long – paying my compliments to the Methodist cardinals, the Lords Day Alliance, the S.V.P., and all the rest – not slightly and meekly as in *M St* and *Babbitt* but at full length, and very, very lovingly...."

Another twelve months and Elmer Gantry rolled – or exploded – off the press. Agnes Birkhead – whose husband Leon assisted Lewis with the background of the novel for six months – has said that Elmer Gantry is a composite of many preachers then living and not a preacher patterned after just one of them. But there was a largely discernible amount of two of America's best known divines in Elmer Gantry. They were Dr. William L. ("Big Bill") Stidger, a Kansas City Methodist, and Dr. John Roach Straton, a New York Baptist.

Stidger's whole relationship with Lewis has made a comic opera complexion. Bill Stidger was 40 and near the pinnacle (or Zenith as Lewis would call it) of his career when he scurried to bring himself to the attention of the famous novelist he heard had come to Kansas City to learn all about preachers.

Stidger was then the pastor of the influential Linwood Boulevard Methodist Church. Stidger had a reputation as a crowd getter, and as a genius in successful church-filling methods. Stidger proudly showed Lewis some of the six volumes he had already published on making Christianity a glad religion and gave the novelist copies to take home, not detecting the leer in Lewis' cold blue eye when he poured out the drama of his astounding pastoral successes and pointed to the secret of it all now enshrined in his writings.

Stidger had hit upon the key to modern church advertising when he invented his revolving electric cross and had it erected on his church at San Jose, California. It got national notice. He moved on to the run-down St. Mark's Methodist Episcopal Church in Detroit, and by adopting a combination of vaudeville and salesmanship techniques soon had his congregation enlarged to an overflow. The new St. Mark's he built included a bowling alley, a gymnasium – and a revolving electric cross.

In *Standing Room Only* (published in 1921 and given the official blessing of Bishop Theodore S. Henderson), Stidger boisterously outlined success so his fellow preachers could follow. The new gospel method was described under chapter headings like "Putting the Punch in Publicity," "Food, Fun and Faith," "Soul Saving Slogans for Churches," "The Fine Art of Tripling the Loose Collection," and – "The Revolving Cross."

Anyone who looks at Elmer Gantry's activities at Banjo Crossing and in Zenith and then takes up Stidger's books will see at once that far from there being a merely vague similarity between the fictional and the living parsons and their methods, Lewis had actually lifted some of Stidger practically verbatim. Elmer Gantry had them standing in the aisles where there had been empty pews before. How did he do it? By inaugurating his "Lively Sunday Evenings." "Christianity was a Glad Religion," he said, "and he was going to make it a lot gladder."

Gantry had them singing "Tipperary," "Pack Up Your Troubles," and "Swanee River." He featured whistling, humming and waving handkerchiefs while singing the hymns; a ukelele solo; a mouth-organ contest; jumping frogs to illustrate a talk on betting; free grape juice to show the superiority of soft over hard drinks; and a wrecked auto right on the pulpit platform to illustrate the madness of the age.

In his chapter "Putting the Punch in Publicity," Stidger urges use of "The Magdalen Focus." "There is always an interest in the fallen woman..." he says. "I have never known this focus to fail in bringing overflow crowds." He then exhibits his advertisement on a "Big Sunday Evening Story Sermon on *The Scarlet Letter*."

When Gantry begins to read literature he discovers a passage in Dickens where Miss Nickleby protects her virtue against Sir Mulberry Hawk, and exclaims "Great stuff. I'll preach on him when I get these hicks educated up to literary sermons."

In the latter third of *Elmer Gantry* the reader comes upon a Methodist and citified Gantry (he began as a country Baptist), who is pastor at Zenith but on his way to the top – a New York pulpit. The closest living model for this would-be fundamentalist dictator was the Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton, pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York City.

When Lewis had been at work on *Gantry* five months and was shaping the last sections of the book, Stanley Walker's article, "The Fundamentalist Pope," appeared in *The American Mercury*. The article sketched the career of Straton and told how he had assumed the mantle of fundamentalist leadership in America upon the death of William Jennings Bryan. As with Stidger, Lewis borrowed wholesale.

Straton was the leading fundamentalist orator of the late twenties in America. No Gantry could ever have exceeded him. The vicarious enjoyment of wickedness that his sermons offered gave his hearers the nearest thing to indulgence in what he denounced. His de-

---

James Benedict Moore *is on the staff of Whittier College, where he directs public information and teaches journalism.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scription of the play *Aphrodite* – he went to the theater only to get ammunition – was so vivid that several of his richest board members resigned immediately after the sermon.

Straton (like Gantry's American Warwick) was a trustee of the Anti-Saloon League and of the Lord's Day Alliance which was fighting Sunday motoring. He had studied oratory at the Boston School of Oratory and Expression and had held pastorates in Chicago, Baltimore and Norfolk before coming to Calvary Baptist in New York. He had written *Church vs. Stage, Our Relapse Into Paganism, The Fakes and Fancies of the Evolutionists,* and debated the orthodox side in *The Famous New York Fundamentalist-Modernist Debates* against Charles Francis Potter. In the burning hot summer of 1928 he went South to campaign against Al Smith, suffered a paralytic stroke, and died.

When Walker's *Mercury* article came out Straton preached on it and said he had been praying for Mencken for years. He invited Mencken to come and hear the girl evangelist, Uldine Utley, at his church. There is no record that Mencken showed up. Straton investigated vice in Chicago, New York and Florida. He said in a sermon that the disastrous Florida hurricane of 1926 was a result of vice there and that it heralded the end of the world.

Between 1924 and 1926, Straton defended the story of Jonah and the whale, scored modernism in magazines, preached against cabaret orgies and ouija boards, agreed to testify at the Scopes evolution trial, said Carl Akeley's evolution pictures were a fraud, challenged Darrow to debate evolution, declared he was not a vice crusader, received a DD degree over which there was considerable question until the president of the college vouched for its authenticity, and deplored the persecution of Aimee Semple McPherson.

Taking a page out of Straton, Lewis had Elmer Gantry become a vice-crusader. In Zenith, Elmer charges into police headquarters and demands action against wickedness in the city. When this is refused, he puts on a police lieutenant's cap, takes his Bible under his arm, and leads the forces of righteousness himself. They manage to arrest a peaceful and bewildered German saloon-keeper and several young women who are entertaining their boy friends. For a month "vice" is ended in Zenith.

Like Straton, Elmer sees himself the champion, at the last, of all the forces of orthodoxy against the modernists, the evolutionists, and the Sabbath-breakers, and he denounces them in prolonged harangues. The tone of the fundamentalist orator, Straton, is nowhere more evident than in the closing lines of *Elmer Gantry,* where we see Elmer vindicated in his last scandalous affair, kneeling before his congregation while they shout their hallelujahs in answer to his roar: "Let me count this day . . . as the beginning of a crusade for complete morality and the domination of the Christian Church throughout all the land. . . . We shall yet make these United States a moral Nation!"

Elmer Gantry was the cause of more sermons volunteering to lynch its creator than Elmer Gantry ever preached against vice and modernism and women going bathing without stockings. One clergyman said, "Lewis is a jackass and this is his last bray. He is a red-headed woodpecker trying to drill a hole in an iron post, and he has broken his bill." Another said, "The book is the product of a mind that was inflamed: a mind that saw pink crows, red snakes, two moons, and six legged rabbits."

"Big Bill" Stidger himself preached a sermon at his lively Sunday evening service in Kansas City. He even managed to find a scriptural quotation for the topic. It was "And Ben-hadad Was Drunk," I Kings 20:16. The popular Methodist told how terribly disappointed he was with the novelist. He said he now regretted ever inviting Lewis into his home. And he made clear that the poor writer, a victim of drink like old King Ben-hadad of Syria, had been drunk the whole time he was creating *Elmer Gantry.*

It took three years for what was left of the Stidger's conscience to catch up with him. In January, 1930, he wrote a long letter to Lewis, asking forgiveness "for that weakness and that injustice to you." He said he would make a public apology.

Lewis' reply was so blistering it caused Stidger's memory of the affair to black out. Within a few weeks he said to *The Kansas City Times,* when they queried him on the public apology: "I really have forgotten what was in the letters and consider the matter closed." So the *Times,* to refresh his memory, published both letters in full side by side, and some who read began to see that *Elmer Gantry* was something more than merely fiction from a mind that saw pink crows and six legged rabbits.

Carl Van Doren summed up the criticism of the perceptive when he said:

> "Most American novelists seem to have taken their clergymen on faith out of a tradition. Mr. Lewis, acutely up-to-date, knew that the twentieth century in America had developed, in the absence of criticism, clergymen who were brawling bellwethers of their flocks, wily, fleshly, unimaginative, arrogant. They might not be numerous, but they did exist. *Elmer Gantry* was the life story of one of them."

When William Allen White said that, in *Elmer Gantry* at least, God had struck the artist Sinclair Lewis dead, he made a criticism which has stuck and which has a measure of fairness when the book is compared with *Main Street, Babbitt, Arrowsmith* and *Ann Vickers.* Notwithstanding this, the patently unfair and undiscerning criticism, levelled from all quarters in the twenties that in *Elmer Gantry* Lewis created "not a single admirable character," and "was too prejudiced and blinded to see any truths about religion in America," is one which any reader may refute.

Sinclair Lewis himself – of whom Dorothy Thompson said that while he may have considered himself an atheist God was not taken in by that – was deeply disturbed by the reaction of the American church and clergy to his novel. If the country could have heard Mencken's great belly laugh as he read of Gantry dreaming of becoming the Warwick of America and all this other comic opera claptrap, so boisterous, so absurd, so full of hokum – yet so true! – America might have let loose its vest and laughed with him.

But America could not laugh at itself, or even at Gantry. America had not the imagination and was fighting mad.

Next Week

Hollywood's "Elmer Gantry"

reviewed by
Stanley Kauffmann

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Self-Portrait of a Suburbanite

by Susan M. Black

Melons, tourists, baseball and air-conditioners are now in season but summertime is off-season for new books. Publishers' lists are meager, which gives the reader his chance to reread *War and Peace* and Orville Prescott his opportunity to take a six-week vacation. Every now and then, however, there is published a pleasant summer novel. This by

This Demi-Paradise:
A Westchester Diary
by Margaret Halsey
(Simon & Schuster; $3.50)

definition (mine) is one that is light in weight and spirit (250 pages or less and a happy ending) and devoid of complications (I have friends who believe that Natasha married Napoleon). Margaret Halsey's fifth is such a novel. (One hesitates in calling it a novel, so thinly disguised is her autobiographical tale of life in suburbia.)

The tale is told by Helen Fitzgibbons, suburban housewife, to her diary every other day or two between one January and the following September. Helen has a husband (Harry, a regional planner), a daughter (Cora, aged 9), an Old Cat and a Young Cat (two Siamese) and a good friend named Cynthia. Cynthia has a husband (Russell, a research chemist), two sons (one beautiful, one stubborn) and a Great-aunt Persis, on whom the uncomplications are centered. Great-aunt Persis, who lives in India and does something about spreading literacy in the villages, is due to visit the United States to raise money for Reading-for-India. When Mrs. Brock Chancellor, a suburban *force majeure*, reads a piece in *Time* and a note in the local paper saying whose guest she will be, she invites the legendary relative, via Cynthia, to speak at a fund-raising luncheon of the Women's Liberal Club, over which she presides. No sooner is the invitation extended, however, than it must be withdrawn, for the American Legion objects: Aunt Persis has spoken to too many groups so they've got her on a list. Mrs. Chancellor explains that her small and struggling organization can't afford to get the Legion angry. Accepting no explanation, Cynthia and Helen declare war on all narrow-minded suburban forces. They win.

The plot will do, augmented as it is by some nice turns of phrase and mind. I liked the descriptions of the passing of the four seasons and the names given to the writer's pet peeves. The supermarket becomes Plethora, Inc., church and minister are St. Euphoria and the Reverend Doctor Aspirin and the nasty next door neighbors are Mr. and Mrs. Sine Qua, "so named because a sine qua is the opposite of a sine qua non – a without-which one would be happy." The answer offered to the opulence of Plethora, Inc.: a row of lepers hunkered down on the pavement outside: "There would be a challenge to togetherness! There, in fact, would be a stable, solid point of reference on which all this privilege could pivot – being properly appreciated by contrast." Mrs. Fitzgibbons-Halsey has given up magazine subscriptions, as they come in so regularly and always the same, while she "would really like a magazine to change its size, its shape and its politics about every third issue." The artifacts and artifices of Eisenhower's America are also up for criticism.

The author's occasional poetry and frequent wit are, unfortunately, submerged in a sea of references to art, music, history and Greek mythology but worst of all, literature. There are allusions to Victor Hugo, Spenser, E. M. Forster, Jane Austen, Jack London, Byron, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Mark Twain, George Orwell, Gene Stratton Porter, Ellen Glasgow, Sir Osbert Sitwell, Milton, Harold Bell Wright, Willa Cather, Edgar Allan Poe, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Emerson, Brother Wordsworth, Squire Robert Frost, Miss Millay; to *Man and His Gods, If, Paradise Lost, Lad: A Dog, The Last Chronicle of Barset, Peyton Place, Humphrey Clinker, Heidi, J'Accuse, Vanity Fair,* the Prisoner of Chillon, the Brothers Karamazov, Tinker Bell, Tom Swift, the Rover Boys, Silas Marner, Mr. Chips, the Shropshire Lads, Andersonville, Tobacco Road, Dotheboys Hall and other titles, people and places that one may (or may not) find in *The Reader's Encyclopedia.* There are quoted (or, for humor's sake, misquoted) lines from Tennyson, Housman, Swinburne, Marvell and others which one *may* find in Bartlett's. And of course there's a smattering of Shakespeare: the title is part of a quote from Richard II ("This other Eden, demi-paradise . . .") and Cora and her friends as they cluster around somebody's new puppy are "a veritable thicket of eight-, nine-, and ten-year-old legs, and looked, I thought, rather like a box of toothpicks come to Dunsinane." And there are only 216 pages.

The author gives herself away in Helen's reaction to a visiting pollster: "I felt that twinge of loneliness I get when I again become aware that the world is full of nothing but engineers and electronics experts – whereas I want it to be full of people who majored in English."

Somewhere in the midst of yesterday's books and as seen through the eyes of yesterday's English major, a

Reviewers acclaim

The Other Journey

POEMS NEW AND SELECTED

by Katherine Garrison Chapin

"The title poem, in varied forms, is truly possessed poetry, with a fine sweep of thought, picture and emotion."—ROBERT HILLYER, *New York Times*

"Delicate, serene, assured."—IRIS ORIGO, *New Republic*

"Restraint, compassion, integrity, dignity—these are the qualities most notable."—SAMUEL FRENCH MORSE, *Virginia Quarterly Review*

"Rich imagery shorn of the extraneous." — PEARL STRACHAN HURD, *Christian Science Monitor*

$3.00

From your bookseller or from

University of Minnesota Press
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clear picture of life in the suburbs emerges. Helen is proud of seeing through the evils of supermarket and church but she shops and worships therein, rationalizing her behavior with conviction and experience. Addressing herself to "the sociologists" she alternately attacks and defends suburbia – with its Girl Scout cookies, its squirrels that eat one's crocus and scilla bulbs, its petty activities – but its adequate schools.

This urban reader was once again forced to conclude about suburbia: a good enough place to write about, but no place to live.

Too Much Government Spending?

by Robert Lekachman

This is a bad year for people who are bored by economics, a group which probably comprises the bulk of the population. For it is inevitable that the question of the American rate of economic growth will be a campaign issue. The Democratic Advisory Council and a great many economists have consistently maintained that we are growing too slowly to achieve any of the major national purposes which we are or ought to be pursuing. At present comparative growth rates, the Russians threaten to overtake us industrially in a period variously estimated from 15 to 25 years. US aid to the underdeveloped countries of South America, Africa, and Asia would encounter less domestic opposition and represent a smaller burden upon our resources, if our economy grew at a decent rate. Finally, our shabby governmental plant – schools, parks, beaches, clinics, hospitals, and museums – could be improved more readily from a larger national income.

The Question of Government Spending
by Francis M. Bator
(Harper; $3.75)

How much growth do we need? Does growth demand a vast expansion of government spending? Will its consequence be either a restriction of freedom or a rapid inflation? Each disputant has his favorite rates of growth, pet indices, and illustrative years of comparison. Depending upon the period the economists examine, they derive more or less alarming conclusions about our recent growth record. They argue about the desirable size of government spending and the relation between government spending and other types of government action, such as more liberal credit policies, stricter anti-trust enforcement, and revision of tax policy.

In all honesty, I cannot recommend Bator instead of Bufferin as a specific for that dull throbbing in the head which comes from reading too many statistics, composed in a terse, compressed style, and sprinkled with rather more symbols than strict necessity demanded. It is one of those books which would be only half as difficult if it were twice as long. Nevertheless, it is decidedly worth the labor needed to grasp its argument because it is the most sensible guide available to the facts and the issues of economic growth.

Take the facts first. How important is government spending? Has it tended to absorb more and more of our economic resources? The answers are interesting. If we exclude defense spending from the calculation on the assumption that its size depends on considerations of survival rather than judgments of ideology, we discover that in 1957 we devoted to governmental purposes 10.3 percent of our total resources. While this was a larger percentage than the 1929 figure of 7.5, it represented a drop from the 13.4 percent of 1939. In the last generation, we have, therefore, actually diminished the proportion of resources for public use.

Many conservatives might complain that this is still too much. They should be reassured to learn that such a capitalist stronghold as West Germany devoted 15.1 percent of its resources to governmental objectives. To the rest of us it might seem even more reassuring that we can drastically increase our spending for desirable public purposes and still remain more nearly a private economy than that paragon of the free market, West Germany. Our leeway is all the greater if we take to heart a useful distinction made by Bator between exhaustive and nonexhaustive public expenditures. Exhaustive expenditures represent an actual demand on the part of the government for goods and services. In the short run the demand can be met only by diminishing the amount of goods and services which are available for private purchase. Nonexhaustive expenditures represent no such drain. Rather they are a transfer, via taxes and subsidies, of income from one group of citizens to another. The net effect is a redistribution of private demand not an increase of public demand. A great and increasing percentage of government spending – social security benefits, agricultural subsidies and the like – consist of such transfers. Decision about their size then hinges on social equity, where opinions inevitably differ, rather than on appropriate divisions between public and private economy.

Bator is just as cool a guide to the issues as he is to the facts. Does government spending cause inflation, as the economic primitives in the Eisenhower Administration appear to believe? In 1929-1931, 1937-1939, and 1948-1949, government spending rose and inflation stayed its hand. Will inflation result when government spending rises faster than Gross National Product? The same years refute this argument as well. Will inflation result whenever taxes exceed 25 percent, as Colin Clark has argued? In the countries where the dread percentage has been approached or exceeded, inflation has frequently not followed. Is government inevitably more inefficient than private enterprise? Where, asks Bator, is the evidence that private enterprise will do better than public administration in running the national defense or even the post office?

"THE MORE KENNEDY TRIES *to turn his youth into a virtue the more his listeners realize that the legendary qualities of youth—freshness of outlook, resoluteness, daring—are exactly the qualities this young man lacks. His ideas are drab pickings from the decadent Liberalism he claims to espouse; his will seems as flabby as Stevenson's, his style was canned and patented on Madison Avenue many years ago. Kennedy's youth, in other words, is* all *that is young about him.*"

From the current issue of NATIONAL REVIEW. Write to Dept. R-4, 150 E. 35 St., New York 16, N. Y., for free copy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ART

Federal Aid to Art: Distribution

Whoever wins the national election in November, most observers agree that it will mark the end of inertia and the renewal of initiative on the part of the American government. Will any of that initiative be available for the fine arts? Should it? If so, what forms should it take? By the end of the 1930's there was a flourishing program of government aid to the fine arts and most Americans are unaware of the scope and of the lasting effects for good produced by the project. By far the most important effect and at the same time the most difficult one to prove was the survival as artists of a whole generation of American painters and sculptors. More tangible effects are the presence in museum collections around the country of easel paintings which would never have got there and very likely would never have been painted at all without the project; the survival still of some mural paintings and monumental sculpture in public buildings on a scale and at an excellence never reached before or since in this country's public art; the existence around the country of numerous small art centers that began under Federal patronage. The silk-screen print, originally an inexpensive form of advertising, was developed as an art by the project. And a very large part of whatever interest, sympathy and understanding of art and craft that now exists among Americans can be traced to Federal art projects at one or two removes.

Alas by the end of the 1930's there was World War II, and, like Lucky Strike green, government art went to war and never came back. Suppose it had, or suppose it could now be returned to life; what should a Federal art project do in the 1960's?

Affecting everything about a new project is the fact that the basic motivation would be different, even opposite from that of the thirties. If we have indeed changed from a society of producers to one of consumers, the government art of the future will follow the trend. Whether we have or have not so changed, the needs of the art public, and especially of the potential art public, outside a small number of big cities, are today much easier to see as genuine needs and are today much more likely to be met as needs than they were a generation ago. One could even argue that the needs are more acute today and government obligation to meet them more unmistakable: since government has delivered the enormous natural resource of television channels over to the cretinization of the masses – in the fine old Surrealist phrase – government has a clear obligation, if not to retard that process directly, at least to assist the citizen in working out his own salvation and that of his family; and the availability of art is one of the classic means of salvation.

The chief argument against new government involvement in art is simply that, except for the emergency of the thirties, the American government never had subsidized art and the whole idea of subsidy seems un-American; the Soviets, it is well known, subsidize large quantities of painting and sculpture, most of it bad. Well, the Soviets, of course, do subsidize art and the Soviet citizen does, in the normal course of things, come in contact with a great deal more art than does the American, and much of it is bad. But the most casual inspection of the chief Soviet museums of Russian art immediately convinces the stroller that there is simply an unbroken tradition of bad art in Russia. The grandiose bombast of Socialist Realism is exactly the same as the grandiose bombast of Czarist narrative, romantic and edifying art. Government subsidy of art was not a Soviet invention. It goes back to the Egyptians and beyond and comes all the way back up. Until the last century most significant European art was produced by government commission; most significant European artists were subsidized, or employed, by government. The Medici, like the Morgans, may have made their money by lending it out, but unlike the Morgans the Medici commissioned art as well as collected it, and they did so not as private bankers but as heads of state. To this day there are few governments that don't pay a lot more conscious official attention to art than ours does. In establishing a continuing government program for art on a non-emergency basis, Americans would not be departing from any worthwhile tradition of their own. They would be joining in a tradition so ancient it helped make civilization.

The most important thing to be said about the "tradition" of governmental non-involvement in art is that the government and therefore the people are involved, whether they want to be or not. Some tax dollars are being spent on art and they'd be spent more intelligently if the official attention to art were more conscious than it has been. The non-existence of any voice for art on the bureau or agency level of government has caused the waste of some of the inadequate money that is spent on art. One way this happens is in the commissioning of works of art for Federal buildings. While there exists congressional authorization for a given percentage of any architectural budget to be spent on art, this percentage is too often absorbed into the other costs of a building for the simple reason that nobody gives a damn. For the same reason, a terribly high proportion of such art as is commissioned for government buildings is piddling stuff, streamlined horses half risen out of concrete waves and massive marble maidens holding aloft the symbols of bland indifference to the 20th Century.

One of the most urgent duties of any new government art project is to see that the American people get full value for money spent on their art and full art representation in their buildings. It is only recent custom, not law, that says government art must be hack work.

A more spectacular involvement of the

BEST PLAY
—N.Y. Drama Critics Circle 1960
TOYS IN THE ATTIC
Mail Orders Filled Promptly
Evgs. Mon. thru Thurs.: Orch. $6.90; Mezz. $5.75, 4.80, 3.60; Balc. $2.90. Fri. & Sat. Evgs.: Orch. $7.50; Mezz. $6.90, 5.75, 4.80; Balc. $3.60, 2.90. Mats. Wed. & Sat.: Orch. $4.80; Mezz. $4.05, 3.60; Balc. $2.30. Enclose self-addressed, stamped envelope with check or money order and list 3 alternate dates. Air-Conditioned
HUDSON Theatre, 141 W. 44th St., N.Y. 36

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government in art has been evident in the numerous controversies of the last decade-and-a-half over American art exhibited abroad under governmental auspices. In every case the controversy took the form it did because no one in the government spoke for art. Art was a commodity in the service of the State Department's information agency and ultimately the agency and the department had to serve other ends than those of American art. American representation on the international art scene has varied from the torpedoed project of Sen. William Benton (under which the government actually purchased paintings for its use abroad), to the present situation, under which a private organization (the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art) determines the make-up of American exhibitions at the most important international shows, Venice and Sao Pao – both of which have more than semi-official overtones in other countries. The Council is certainly performing a patriotic service and some of its work – notably a current exhibition in Italy of Italian art in American collections – has been brilliant in conception and execution. But who pays the piper calls the tune and the Council's favorite tune in American art is abstract expressionism, the opposite extreme from the stodgy symbolism of our official monumental art.

The situation is that of a private institution performing a public function, but, since the Council is a non-profit educational entity, it is financed by contributions deductible from the contributors' taxable incomes. To some extent the government is paying for the performance of a public function which it ought to be performing itself.

Both the foregoing examples are of areas in which the government is involved in art willy-nilly and which common-sense tells us could be better handled if handled consciously, deliberately and with a clear eye fixed on the general welfare insofar as that is related to art. We are not going to win the cold war by art exhibitions abroad, but if we do have such exhibitions they should be shaped by government intelligence devoted to art, not politics. We are not going to achieve the golden age at home by having more or even better murals and statues in our public buildings, but if we do have murals and statues, they should be the best obtainable; that goal is achieved by hiring the best obtainable artists and that is done by placing the hiring in the hands of someone who knows the field.

Beyond such salvaging operations, government art in the sixties could concentrate on art for the general welfare to the considerable profit of the country. The WPA of the thirties created at least the nucleus of the present market for art and much of the material for that market is already in the public domaine. There isn't a major museum in the country that doesn't have more material than it can hope to exhibit. Much of the material is duplication and the museums would be amenable to long-term loans or even to slowly circulating exhibitions, but the smaller art centers – in colleges, universities and libraries as well as in art museums proper – are totally unable to pay for either the transportation or the insurance, to say nothing of installation changes needed for security. In this area a relatively tiny expenditure of Federal funds could produce very quick results of new availability of art for its public.

In some parts of the country there is no question but Federal art centers should be established, as they were once, for the reason that local initiative or local ability to pay is non-existent. In commissioning new work, in addition to that needed for government construction, any new Federal effort in the arts should move very slowly, both for the obvious reasons of self-protection and because there is a great gap between what is already potentially available and the audience for that work. Commissions in the general welfare, as distinguished from the salvaging of Federal funds, could easily begin with print commissions for a couple of hundred centers and progress to cast sculpture for a couple of dozen before tackling the unique and costly individual work.

There is no longer the need to set up a truly national network of Federal art centers. We live in a "mixed" economy, public and private. Government art initiative will certainly work as much as possible through and with existing private art institutions. The art scene, too, is mixed, but for a long time, now, the private components have been much too dominant.

FRANK GETLEIN

Correspondence

The New Republic welcomes communications in regard to subjects of current interest. Those of 300 words or less are most suitable for publication.

The Ticket

Sirs:

The display last week of inflated emotions and punctured egos of your correspondents on "The Democratic Decision" discloses a petulant and dangerous ignorance of what is at stake in November. Those who are taking up ball and glove and going home because their man was not chosen captain should be informed of the following:

1) Nixon would have trampled on Stevenson in a contest. With his careful stance, squarely in the center of everyone's safe zone, Nixon will run close to any opponent, and we may be sure that against Stevenson he would have made the most of the manufactured "soft on Communism" issue. Kennedy and Nixon will be more evenly matched as campaigners, and the Massachusetts Senator will give back as good as he gets on any issue. No one can deny that he will run more strongly than either Symington or Johnson. So, while it is possible that if a few delegates had stood fast at Los Angeles we might have had Adlai (or Stu or Lyndon), we probably would have had him only until November.

2) It is increasingly obvious that to add to the weakness of our amorphous political parties the stalemate of an Administration and Congress of different allegiance is to stifle all effective legislation. Nixon would face a Democratic Congress for possibly four years; we would expect the most arid period for legislation in recent history.

3) Nixon's competence in foreign affairs is at least as conjectural as Kennedy's; all we know of him is that he can talk gruffly when the TV cameras are on him. Kennedy will surround himself in Washington with the most capable and liberal foreign affairs advisers; he will choose either Stevenson or Bowles as his Secretary of State. Nixon's choice is anyone's guess – will he continue with Herter? Douglas Dillon? J. Clifford Folger?

And any Democrat who prefers Nixon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Kennedy deserves to be tarred and feathered by the genuine variety.

I have deliberately said nothing of Kennedy's merits; the editors have done that well. Kennedy and his organization worked ably and strenuously for four years, and, as Adlai said, he deserved the nomination. I look forward to his remarkable energy and dynamic force in the service of the highest office of the land.

Robert S. Clark, Lt. j.g.
US Naval Reserve
Annapolis, Maryland

Sirs:

Like many other liberals I suppose, I'd hoped that the North and South would slug it out at the Democratic Convention. Naturally then, I was stunned by the announcement that Lyndon Johnson was to be the second man, but I rebounded within hours. I think political logic very nearly compels liberals to *welcome* this move.

Most every liberal seems to agree that with Johnson on the ticket we are more likely at the up-coming session of Congress to get legislation passed dealing with housing, minimum wages, federal aid to education, and social-security-based medical insurance for the aged. But isn't it reasonable to hope for developments of even greater and more lasting significance?

Item: If the Congress acts as most liberals now seem to expect that it will, won't Johnson be cast as a liberal during the campaign? And as he plays this role isn't it likely that he will begin to adjust his thinking in accordance with the demands the role will make of him?

Item: Isn't it likely that Johnson's elevation to the Vice Presidency will give the Kennedy administration, if it wins the election, a more liberal Congressional leadership than it would have if a defeated Johnson remained as Majority Leader of the Senate?

Item: Is it so unreasonable to hope that Johnson, the Vice President, with a national political base, will be a different man from Johnson the Senator, responsible to a Texas political base, and being required to run for re-election in the Texas primary elections?

Item: Won't the Kennedy administration be in a much better position to make progress on school desegregation, and related civil rights issues with Johnson acting as one of its spokesmen, than it would be if Johnson stood to the side as a more or less disinterested observer?

Item: Isn't it possible that it has occurred – or will occur – to Senator Johnson that no Southerner (even one posing as a Westerner) can come to the Presidency over the normally accepted routes, but that he might make it if he transforms himself into a national figure in the Vice Presidency? And how can he accomplish the transformation except by conducting himself as at least a moderate liberal?

Item: Does not Lyndon Johnson's nomination give us the best insurance we can buy against the chance that the campaign will degenerate into a kind of small-scale war of the bigots?

Brendan Sexton
Detroit, Michigan

Sirs:

Please don't think that all your readers subscribe to the forlorn wailing evinced by Messrs. (or Mesdames as the case may apply) Ury, Warnock, Phoebus, and Israel (July 25). I too was a Stevenson supporter, even to the point of voting for him in the Pennsylvania primary, but in the name of heaven he is not the only man in the blessed land capable of administering the Presidency! Personally, I am disgusted with this group of idolatrous, cry-baby liberals who would rather run to Dick's smiling embrace than admit to the vulnerability and manifest political weakness of their twice-rejected superman. Congratulations on your correct and wise support of Senator Kennedy.

Thomas P. Fondy
Pittsburgh, Penna.

Sirs:

As a staunch Stevenson supporter in 1952 and 1956 and to the bitter end in 1960, I feel I have a right to protest the rather emotional and irrational letters from disappointed Stevenson fans. Whatever reservations I may have about Kennedy, I can see no justification whatever for such violent reactions. Kennedy was only my third choice (after Stevenson and Humphrey), still I feel that I can vote for him without compromising my integrity.

What some of them seemed to be saying was that if the Republicans put up Rockefeller they would have no choice but to vote for him. (One of them even threatened to vote for Nixon.) The chief argument against Kennedy seems to be that he used his youth, charm, and money unfairly. Well, it would seem that Mr. Rockefeller is hardly free from that charge himself. Apparently it's all right for a Republican to have money, but not a Democrat. It is held that Kennedy's views are not held sincerely. While I regard this as a perfectly legitimate question it seems to me that there is absolutely no proof whatever that this is true. At least it would be a matter of decency to maintain an open mind until some kind of proof became evident. . . . It should be remembered that the general concensus in 1932 was that Roosevelt had little stature, and some pretty harsh things were said of Lincoln, too. I am not pointing to any similarity of Kennedy's to either Roosevelt or Lincoln, since I see none, but I *am* pointing out the unreliable nature of such pre-judgments.

In any event, Mr. Stevenson has stated over and over again in past months his high personal regard for Mr. Kennedy.

EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING"
Self-hypnosis. Use your phonograph, recorder. Fascinating, educational. Details free.
Sleep-Learning Research Association
Box 24-NR Olympia, Washington

OUT-OF-PRINT BOOKS
Name the book—we'll find it for you! All subjects —no obligation to buy. Write Books-On-File. Dept. NR, Union City, New Jersey.

WE MOVE YOU WITHOUT TEARS
Economical, insured moving and storage vans, wagons—NYC, resorts, long distance
AL 5-8343
The Padded Wagon, Inc. New York, N. Y.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

"L'EXPRESS"
The leading liberal newspaper in France today.
Send 10¢ for your sample copy.
Howard Publications
Dept. SB,
173 Third Avenue
New York 3

LET US MAKE YOUR OPINIONS COUNT
Let us send them
to every Congressman
Let us do this for 33 cents a month
ACOPOLL (NR) 430 S. Michigan, Chicago, Ill.

COLLECTOR'S ITEM
Limited, L.P. Record. Adlai Stevenson's speech on Jesse Fell-Lincoln at Madison Civil War Round Table. $3.95 prepaid.
STEVENSON RECORD
111 W. MAIN STREET MADISON 3, WISCONSIN

Printed by National Publishing Co., 301 N St., N.E., Washington 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If his supporters think so much of his judgment, why can't they take this statement at its face value. After all, there is no possible proof that Stevenson would have been a great President. I still think he should have been President, but this is just as much faith as it is based on evidence. However I may hate to admit it, Mr. Stevenson is not without fault, especially as a politician. To deny that he was at least partly author of his own defeats is as unrealistic as to paint Mr. Kennedy as some kind of menace.

The question of Kennedy's capacity is far from settled, but it reflects little credit on anyone to deny the many evidences of this capacity that he has already shown. History ought to cause anyone to hesitate before they claim that they have any insight into what constitutes greatness, and how one is able to divine it. *Robert C. Lechner*
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Sirs:

May I point out to all the enraged liberal Democratic defectors that in so doing they are only kidding themselves. They merely assure us that Stevenson and Bowles, not having won the choice spot, will now not even serve us in the State Department; that Nixon can now fool the independents and the Democratic liberals as well; that this nation will then only be worse off because a few people sulked.... Somehow it doesn't seem appropriate for "those who prefer Adlai" not to prefer also the interest for which he stands. His contingent well might be grateful for John Kennedy's good judgment in promising him great advisory powers in a new administration. Kennedy could have cast him by the way as in the strict rules of politics he may have had a right to do. That is, after all, what the "liberals" expected him to do with Lyndon Johnson. *Nancy McMurray*
Staunton, Virginia

Sirs:

Lest the editors of *The New Republic* feel they are alone in their carefully reasoned support of John Kennedy, let me hasten to say that I endorse your position one hundred percent.

With growing irritation I have watched the stream of letters from Stevensonian "liberals" denouncing your stand. They are overlooking several essential facts. The widely acclaimed platform was hammered out by Chester Bowles who is four-square for Kennedy. And there is no evidence that Johnson's nomination is betraying that platform; rather Johnson's unequivocal backing of the platform is more convincing evidence to the South that it had better catch up with 20th-Century America than any pronouncement from Governor G. Mennen Williams.

These "liberals" are also overlooking the fact that the country is not going to have any single-region liberalism jammed down its throat. Rather, the independent voter (who is the key to this election) will follow the man who can offer a carefully reasoned plan for progress, and a man who can convince them that he has the intelligence and vitality to carry out this program. John Kennedy has the best chance for uniting the country behind him and restoring some of this country's prestige as a leader in the Western world. *Roland A. Labine*
New York, N. Y.

Sirs:

We haven't lost Adlai; he simply takes a different address. Our boy John F. will be as liberal as the office permits and the men around him are real flame-throwing liberals.... Let us therefore not abandon the party nor even yet the *NR*, but press on with courage and conviction. *John F. Weatherly*
Auburndale, Mass.

Send the next 10 issues of *The New Republic* as my gift to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

NAME OF DONOR .....

ADDRESS .....

☐ $1 enclosed

Send the next 10 issues of *The New Republic* as my gift to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

NAME OF DONOR .....

ADDRESS .....

☐ $1 enclosed

Send the next 10 issues of *The New Republic* as my gift to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

NAME OF DONOR .....

ADDRESS .....

☐ $1 enclosed

Send the next 10 issues of *The New Republic* as my gift to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

NAME OF DONOR .....

ADDRESS .....

☐ $1 enclosed

Campaign Coverage Insurance

$1- *for the next 10 issues*

So that more voters may enjoy NR's candid comment on politics, this $1 gift offer is made only for a limited time in Presidential election years.

Fill out the Gift Coupon On the Left, Enclose $1 for Each Gift Subscription and Mail Promptly to:

THE NEW REPUBLIC
1244 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED